

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 843

SP 028 859

AUTHOR Wiegman, John R.; Binnie, David G.
TITLE Attitudes toward Merit Pay for Instructional Personnel: A Survey of Florida Public District Policy Makers and Administrators. The Relationship of Expectancy Work Motivation, Selected Situational Variables and Locus of Control to Teacher Job Satisfaction.
INSTITUTION Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc., Ft. Myers.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 64p.
AVAILABLE FROM FERDC, P.O. Box 506, Sanibel, FL 33957 (\$3.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
JOURNAL CIT Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc. Research Bulletin; v19 n2 Win 1985
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Expectation; *Job Satisfaction; *Merit Pay; School Districts; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Salaries; Teaching Conditions; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

This research bulletin contains parts of two studies dealing with the persistent problem of developing effective teachers and stimulating effective teaching. The study reported in "Attitudes toward Merit Pay for Instructional Personnel" (John Weigman) was conducted to survey, analyze, and compare the attitudes of Florida public school district policy makers and administrators toward merit pay. Of the 364 respondents (out of 510 who received the survey instrument) it was found that 39 percent supported merit pay for teachers, with most support coming from personnel administrators and school board members, and least support from superintendents. The introduction, reviews of literature, conclusions, and bibliography of this study are included in the bulletin. "The Relationship of Expectancy Work Motivation, Selected Situational Variables and Locus of Control to Teacher Job Satisfaction" (David G. Binnie) investigated correlations among teacher job satisfaction, teaching experience, teacher motivation, teaching conditions, and locus of control among Florida teachers. Results indicated that the concept of "job satisfaction" is of somewhat limited practical and theoretical value and that job satisfaction may be better approached through indirect rather than direct methods. The summary and bibliography of the study are included. (CB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

☒ Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

ED282843

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

RESEARCH BULLETIN

ATTITUDES TOWARD MERIT PAY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL: A SURVEY OF FLORIDA PUBLIC DISTRICT POLICY MAKERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
John R. Wiegman

THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXPECTANCY WORK MOTIVATION, SELECTED SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND LOCUS OF CONTROL TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by
David G. Binnie

SP 028 859

Volume 19

Winter, 1985

Number 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

RESEARCH BULLETIN

PUBLISHED BY
Florida Educational Research
and
Development Council, Inc.

Additional copies of this book may be obtained from:

FERDC
P.O. Box 506
Sanibel, Florida 33957

Individual Copies \$3.00
• Annual Subscription (4 Issues) \$10.00

10% Discount on an order of 5 or more

*Order of less than \$20.00 must be accompanied by
a check or money order.*

MEMBERS COUNTIES

SUPERINTENDENTS

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Alachua County
Charlotte County
Citrus County
Collier County
DeSoto County
Dixie County
Glades County
Hamilton County
Hendry County
Hernando County
Highlands County
Hillsborough County
Indian River County
Lee County
Madison County
Manatee County
Marion County
Martin County
Nassau County
Okeechobee County
Palm Beach County
Pasco County
St. Johns County
St. Lucie County
Santa Rosa County
Sarasota County
Suwannee County
Taylor County
Union County
Volusia County
Wakulla County

Dr. Douglas Magann
Robert L. Bedford
Carl Austin
Dr. Thomas L. Richey
Larry Browning
James E. Hurst
Linda Green Taylor
Fred D. Greene
Dr. William Burke
Dr. James K. Austin
Ruth E. Handley
Dr. Raymond Shelton
Dr. James A. Burns
Dr. James E. Melvin
Randall M. Buchanan
Gene Witt
Ralph S. Archibald III
V. James Navitsky
Craig Marsh
Danny Mullins
Thomas Mills
Thomas E. Weightman
Otis Mason
George Hill
Bennett C. Russell
Dr. James Fox
Frank Strankunas
Glenda Hamby
James Cason, III
James E. Surratt
Dr. William E. Whaley

Dr. Douglas Magann
John Weigman
Enrico Pepe
Donald Thomsen
Phyllis NeSmith
Lloyd Jones
Linda Green Taylor
James Coe
Ken Dooley
Martin Youngmann
David W. Robinson, Jr.
John Hilderbrand
Jackson McAfee
Donald Stone
Bill Roberts
Virgil Mills
Lee Rowell
Terrance Horrigan
James T. Northey
Danny Mullins
James Daniels
Mary Giella
Don Wilson
Hartford Granitz
Frank Green
Rick Nations
Marvin Jones
Glenda Hamby
Howard G. McNeill
Evelyn J. Lynn
Fran Kochan

F.E.R.D.C. NOTES ON THIS EDITION

This edition contains parts of two studies. One study by John Wiegman, completed at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, Florida, and the other study by David Binnie, completed at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida.

The introduction, review of related literature, the conclusions and the bibliography of Mr. Wiegman's study and the summary and the bibliography of Mr. Binnie's study were selected to be included in this Bulletin. The complete dissertations of both these authors are available at their respective universities for those readers wishing to read the complete studies.

It is the opinion of Florida Educational Research & Development Council, Inc., that both topics are timely, relevant, and contribute to the literature on the persistent problem of developing effective teachers and stimulating effective teaching.

Students and practitioners in educational leadership should find this Bulletin of great interest. Almost anyone can be taught the mechanics of administration. However, leadership can only emerge when the human spirit is nurtured, the dignity and worth of the human being promoted, and the energy potential of the human work force released in positive and satisfying ways.

Charlie T. Council

Executive Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ATTITUDES TOWARD MERIT PAY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL by John Weigman

1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Importance of the Study	1
Research Questions	3
Basic Assumptions	3
Scope and Limitations	4
Definition of Terms	5
2. SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ..	6
Introduction	6
Definitions	6
History	8
Theory	13
Assets & Liabilities	15
Essential Elements	19
3. SUMMARY	30
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	34
Bibliography	24

II. THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXPECTANCY WORK MOTIVATION, SELECTED SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND LOCUS OF CONTROL TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION by David G. Binnie

Statement of the Problem	35
Significance of the Problem	35
Conceptual Framework	36
Hypotheses	37
Design	37
Results for Hypotheses	38
Conclusions	39
Recommendations for Further Research	43
List of References	45

**FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.**

OFFICERS:

President, Don Stone
Treasurer, Rick Nations

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Lee Rowell, John Hilderbrand, Evelyn Lynn, Jackson McAfee, Phyllis NeSmith, Mary Giella, Terrance Horrigan, Fran Kochan, James Daniels, Glenda Hamby

ADVISORS TO THE BOARD:

Charles Hayes, Central Florida Community College
Charles Henderson, University of Florida
Cecil Carlton, State Department of Education
Sandra K. McDonald, University of North Florida
Jake Beard, Florida State University
Patricia Manning, University of Central Florida
Sharon Kossack, Florida International University
R. Hayman Kite, Florida Atlantic University
William Castine, Florida A & M
Sam Matthews, University of West Florida
John Follman, University of South Florida

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Charlie T. Council, Florida Atlantic University and
Southwest Florida Teacher Educational Center

ATTITUDES TOWARD MERIT PAY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL:

A Survey of Florida Public School District
Policy Makers and Administrators

by
John R. Wiegman

Part I INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to survey, analyze, and compare the attitudes of Florida public school district policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this preliminary investigation to examine, through the use of a survey instrument, how Florida public school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators perceived merit pay for instructional personnel.

Importance of the Study

The need for this study has been exemplified by the extent of the national dialogue over teacher merit pay. Vigorously debated on and off in most of the nation's school systems for over half a century, this issue is not unlike the "proverbial cat" of children's literature, who keeps coming back despite its owner's attempts to "lose" it!

The intensity and earnestness of today's merit pay debate, however, may well differ from past discussions. In the fact of declining enrollments, taxpayer revolts, and new developments in teacher performance measurement, states and school districts are now considering merit pay in a climate unlike that which characterized earlier "experiments."¹

Aided by the recent release of a number of prominent national school reform studies, merit pay has, for the moment, found its way back into the national spotlight. Of these recent reports, the National Commission on Excellence in Education's, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, has been the most widely publicized. Its recommendations, characteristics of those found in

many contemporary studies, reflect a re-awakened concern over the need to compensate teachers based upon their ability to perform.²

Representing a performance and productivity based teacher compensation system, merit pay proponents herald it as a major educational reform; an answer to the problem of attracting, motivating and retaining a highly qualified public school instructional staff. Belief in these and other purported merit pay benefits have prompted the legislatures of as many as twenty states to consider proposing some form of merit pay statute in 1984.¹ While the legislative merit pay debate continues elsewhere, however, our own State of Florida has already claimed the distinction of having enacted the nation's "first" statewide teacher merit pay plan. Embodied in the Educational Reform Act of 1983, the Florida Meritorious Instructional Personnel Program seeks, according to Florida Governor Robert Graham, "to recognize superior ability among Florida's classroom teachers"² (see Appendix A).

In view of the current legislative focus on merit pay, local educational leaders throughout the nation, and particularly those in Florida, are faced with the challenge of responsibility assessing the value and feasibility of paying teachers based upon the quality of their classroom performance. It is within this context of impending action that the need for a preliminary descriptive study on merit pay for instructional personnel assumes importance. Through the use of timely base-line data, local educational policy administrators may be able to avoid some of the difficulties often associated with the construction approval and administration of merit pay programs.

¹Larry W. Barber and Karen Klein, "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation," *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (December 1983): 247.

²National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), pp. 30-33.

¹Chris Piphio, "Stateline," *Phi Delta Kappan* 3 (November 1983): 165.

²Florida, Press Release from the Office of the Governor, "Graham Proposes Meritorious Teacher Program" (Tallahassee, FL, 1983).

Research Questions

An examination of the following research questions was central to this study:

1. What are the expressed attitudes of Florida public school district policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel?
2. Are the overall attitudes of Florida public school district policy makers and administrators nonsupportive toward merit pay for instructional personnel?
3. How do the overall attitudes of Florida school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators compare toward merit pay for instructional personnel?
4. Do selected demographic variables play a significant role in explaining any differences in the overall attitudes of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel?

Consistent with normative research design, the above questions were developed to address broad views toward the study topic. As such, they are posed in descriptive rather than in experimental terms.

Basic Assumptions

The framework of this investigation was constructed using the following series of basic assumptions:

1. That school board members, superintendents, and district-level administrators possess attitudes about merit pay for instructional personnel
2. That all of the above groups, based upon their knowledge, attitudes and beliefs at the time of the survey, will indicate their true feelings about merit pay for instructional personnel
3. That a questionnaire instrument can be developed which will require respondents to provide the data necessary for this study
4. That responses provided through the questionnaire instrument will adequately represent the total population

In addition to the above explicit assumptions, this study relied upon several implicit assumptions:

1. That the attitudes of district educational leadership do affect policy making and practice
2. That the attitudes of district educational leadership do translate into behaviors
3. That the extent of the commitment made by district educational leadership to implementing organizational change is highly related to its eventual success

Scope and Limitations

It was the intent of this study to conduct, during the 1983-84 academic year, a preliminary descriptive research study on the attitudes toward merit pay for instructional personnel. All survey data were collected through the use of a mailed questionnaire instrument which was constructed for this investigation by this author. Those surveyed included Florida public school county board members, superintendents, and district-level instructional and personnel administrators.

It is acknowledged that this study contains all of the limitations which are generally associated with descriptive survey research and, in particular, those which make use of the mailed questionnaire technique.¹ It should further be recognized that the process of measuring attitudes is one of approximation, and that where a questionnaire instrument has been employed, it can only be verbalized attitudes which are assessed. The implication of such an acknowledgement is that actual behaviors may well differ from expressed attitudes.²

Lastly, it is noted that the results obtained through this study are limited only to those opinions of the respondents which were expressed at the time of the questionnaire administration.

Definition of Terms

Certain commonly used terms may have a variety of interpretations. For this reason, the following have been defined for the purpose of this study, and are assumed to be valid only within the context of this effort.

ATTITUDE—A manner of responding that demonstrates one's disposition, feeling, or opinion.

BACKGROUND FACTORS—Selected variables utilized on the questionnaire instrument which characterize the respondent.

DISTRICT-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR—One who serves as the major assistant to the superintendent of schools for the management of curriculum and/or personnel.

INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL—Those classroom teachers who are directly held responsible for arranging the conditions of learning for students.

MERIT PAY—A teacher compensation system based upon an evaluation of classroom performance.

¹Ralph H. Jones, *Methods and Techniques of Educational Research* (Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1973), pp. 140-46.

²Marlene E. Henerson, Lynn Lyons Morris, and Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon, *How to Measure Attitudes* (Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications, 1978), pp. 11-13.

PART II A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This selected review of the literature seeks to acquaint the reader with the topic of merit pay for teachers; its definition, its development, the theory upon which it is based, its assets and liabilities, and those guidelines which experience has suggested will enhance its implementation.

Definition

Lacking a commonly accepted frame of reference, particularly among non-educators, merit pay discussions have frequently been fraught with vague and scrambled discourse. In an acknowledgment of the use of overly obscure references, English has observed that "the public discussion about merit pay is clouded by double-talk, hidden agendas, and outright confusion."¹ This lack of precision in discussions of merit pay has been further exacerbated by the tendency to use terms typically assumed to be synonymous.

Differentiated staffing, performance contracting, master teacher, incentive pay, and career ladder, although often differing in terms of form and degree, have all at one time or another been used interchangeably with merit pay. Noting this inclination, Templeton has written that,

. . . in practice, (merit pay) programs range from vague statements which allow school boards to exceed regular pay schedules under some conditions to programs in which all teachers and administrators are paid according to an evaluation rating.¹

The editors of *Education USA* also acknowledge that:

. . . in the first place, not everyone is talking about the same bird. Merit pay plans range from small checks given a few teachers at a community recognition ceremony to hefty bonuses up to \$6,000, given teachers after elaborate evaluations.²

In *Merit Pay for Teachers*, the Educational Research Service concludes that,

. . . given the multitude of definitions of merit pay and the various types of merit pay plans that have been tried in

schools, it is inevitable that differences of opinion have frequently arisen over what actually constitutes a 'merit pay plan' for teachers.³

Apart from the inconsistency that characterizes pay terminology, however, Templeton finds no particular challenge in arriving at a definition of merit pay. The term, in the most general sense, merely "means paying a teacher according to the quality of his teaching."¹ Adding only a slight degree of specificity, Wagoner states that merit pay represents "a salary schedule which provides for additional pay for teachers adjudged to be superior according to established criteria."²

The actual ease with which merit pay can be defined can be witnessed through an examination of formal dictionary definitions of the term. The Dictionary of Education, for example, provides us with the following definition:

Salary schedule, merit type: a plan of paying teachers involving increases in salary on the basis of proficiency rather than length of service.³

Dejnoska and Kapel, in their *American Educator's Encyclopedia*, exhibit the consistency found in many textbook definitions of merit pay by identifying it as being a salary adjustment paid to employees on the basis of qualitative differences in performance.⁴

Observing actual practice rather than relying on academic definitions, Bhaerman has found that merit pay definitions typically fall into one of two categories, old style and new style. Traditional type, or "old style," merit pay plans are characterized by the use of rating scales devised to assess such "input factors" as teaching quality, ethical and professional behavior, cooperation with other staff, and "extra-mile" service. The "new style" approach, on the other hand, is more scientifically based. Under such merit plans, pay is given for measurable classroom results, or as termed by Bhaerman, "output factors."¹

From a consideration of the aforementioned examples, it might appear that the practice of inconsistently interpreting and applying merit pay terminology, rather than the difficulty in actually discerning a definition, could better account for the creation of much of the ambiguity which

seems to accompany the issue.

History

A review of teacher merit pay history could be likened to a "deja vu" experience; its pattern is cyclical. The merit pay literature of twenty-five years ago differs little from that of today. Many of "yesterday's" merit pay issues and concerns, still largely intact, have merely resurfaced for another examination. In a 1961 doctoral study, Rometo, noting a wave of resurgence of public and professional interest in merit pay, wrote,

This interest (merit pay) has been expressed by lay citizens, state legislators, members of boards of education, and professional educators in various parts of the country. Many articles have been written on the issue of salary increases based on quality of teaching performance. In recent conventions and conferences of school men, this highly controversial subject has also played a prominent role.¹

(FOOTNOTES)

¹Fenwick W. English, "Merit Pay: Reflections on Education's Lemon Tree," *Educational Leadership* 41 (December 1983/January 1984):72.

¹Ian Templeton, *Merit Pay* (Eugene, Oregon: Educational Management Review Series, Number 10, November, 1972), p. 1.

²Editors, *Education USA*, October 13, 1983, p. 68.

³Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay for Teachers*, (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979), p. 3.

¹Templeton, *Merit Pay*, p. 1.

²Roderic L. Wagoner, "The Case for Competition," *The Clearing House* 44 (October 1969):111.

³Carter V. Good, ed., *Dictionary of Education*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959), p. 474.

⁴Edward L. Dejnozka and David E. Kapel, *American Educators' Encyclopedia* (Greenwood Press, 1982), p. 319.

¹Robert L. Bhaerman, "Merit Pay? No!," *National Elementary Principals* 52 (February 1973):63-64.

¹Arthur Frank Rometo, "Attitudes of Teachers, Administrators and School Directors of Pennsylvania Toward Merit Rating" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1961), p. 1.

²William M. French, *America's Educational Tradition* (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964), pp. 67, 314-15.

Prior to the early 1920s, it was customary practice to pay teachers solely on the basis of performance or "merit." Typically school select committees, boards of trustees, or school administrators would maintain the prerogative to bargain the pay of each individual teacher. This exclusive, often subjective, regulation of each teachers salary was generally determined by the ratio of teacher applicants to the willingness of the community to pay for such services.² It was throughout this period that differentiated salaries for male and female, elementary and secondary teachers were the rule, as was the practice of varying the salaries of those for whom it was determined possessed unequal levels of abilities.

The nation's first recorded merit pay plan for teachers was established in 1908 in Newton, Massachusetts.¹ Following this initial adoption of a formal merit pay program, the use of such compensation plans rose in number to a peak in the 1920's. With the Depression years of the 1930's, however, and the industrial growth accompanying World War II, merit plans were widely abandoned in favor of the single salary schedule which uniformly compensated teachers on the basis of experience and education rather than on the quality of performance.²

Interest in teacher merit pay re-emerged in the mid-50s as a result of pronounced public pressure for school improvements. During this period, enthusiasm for teacher merit pay was evidenced by the adoption of teacher merit pay legislation in several states, and its review in many others. In a 1956-57 study, the National Education Association found that despite apparent widespread popular interest in the teacher merit pay concept, only 6.3 percent of all school systems in communities with a population of 30,000 or more had actually authorized higher salaries for superior service.¹

The use of merit pay plans for teachers next grew to about 10 percent of the nation's school systems in the 1960s, while declining more than three percentage points the following decade.² During this period, Kleinman reported that several state legislatures had exhibited an interest in merit pay through the authorization of large scale studies and/or experiments. Two such states, Delaware and New York, actually put merit plans into effect, but later found them to be impractical to support.³

Love noted, in a 1970 doctoral study, that ten states had either considered or actually carried out large scale teacher merit pay experiments within the past twenty-five years.⁴ In a major state-initiated study, and at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars, a Utah school merit pay committee examined the issue for several years before reflecting their use due to the difficulty of objectively linking pay to performance.¹

While interest in teacher merit pay has tended to be primarily demonstrated at the local or state level, the federal government, under the direction of the United States Office of Education, experimented with merit pay by entering into "performance contracts" with several school systems in the early 1970s. These agreements, built around student achievement outcomes, provided pay incentives not only for "productive" teachers, but also rewarded high scoring students, and in some cases, went so far as to compensate the parents of such students.²

A major teacher merit pay study conducted in 1977-78 by the Education Research Service found that 115 school systems, or 4 percent, spread across thirty-four states, reported a merit or incentive pay plan in operation for teachers. Another 239 districts, or 8 percent, indicated that they had tried but abandoned such plans due, primarily, to administrative or personnel problems.³ Although Florida reported no school systems with a merit or incentive plan for teachers currently in operation at the time of the Educational Research Service (ERS) study, the state did note that seven school districts had instituted, and abandoned, teacher merit pay plans¹ (see Appendix B).

With public schooling again undergoing intensive scrutiny, merit pay has, as in earlier times, re-emerged as a major reform proposal. Noting the reception now going accorded to merit pay, Glen Robinson, Director of Research for the Educational Research Service, has commented that,

Public education is sensitive to public opinion and the changing demands in American politics. Current proposals

from various presidential candidates, state governors, and other prominent public officials for some form of merit or incentive pay as a way of improving public education place new pressure on school officials to develop some form of workable merit pay.²

(FOOTNOTES)

¹Arthur Frank Rometo, "Attitudes of Teachers, Administrators and School Directors of Pennsylvania Toward Merit Rating" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1961), p. 1.

²William M. French, *America's Educational Tradition* (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964), pp. 67, 314-15.

¹Glen E. Robinson, "Paying Teachers for Performance and Productivity: Learning from Experience," *ERS Concerns in Education* (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, May 1983), p. 3.

²Rozanne Weissman, "Merit Pay - What Merit?," *Education Digest* 34 (May 1969):16.

¹National Education Association, *Superior Service Maximums in Teacher Salary Schedules, 1956-57* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association Research Division, 1957), pp. 56-57.

²*Staff Report to the Governor's Educational Study Committee and Report to the Governor by the Governor's Education Study Committee* (Baton Rouge, LA: Governor's Education Study Committee, May 1975), p. 151.

³Jack H. Kleinman, "Merit Pay - The Big Question," *NEA Journal* 52 (May 1963):42-44.

⁴Harris Edward Love, "An Identification and Evaluation of Merit Pay Factors" (Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1970), p. 25.

¹*Utah School Merit Study: Report and Recommendations* (Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Study Committee, November 1958), p. 11.

²Harry S. Broudy, *The Real World of the Public School* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), pp. 100-01/

³Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay for Teachers*, p. 34.

Several recent national surveys reflect the extent of interest in the concept of merit pay for teachers. A Gallup Poll, published in 1983, showed that 61 percent of those sampled favored paying teachers based on the quality of their work.³ Education USA reported the results of a 1983 Newsweek Poll which found that 80 percent of their respondents supported merit pay. Two opinion polls indicated that support for the merit pay concept was not limited to the general public or to those outside of education. In a May 1983 survey of 7,300 randomly selected teachers, researchers for the National School Boards Association found that, of the 1,261 tabulated responses, 65 percent agreed that teachers should be paid according to how well they perform in the classroom.² In its July 1983 survey of school superintendents, the American Association of School Administrators used returns from 1,215 respondents to demonstrate that 80 percent of those polled endorsed the concept of merit pay.³

One effect of this national concern over improving education through the use of some form of merit pay has been that, since January of 1983, thirty-three states have considered the question of differential pay and status for exemplary teachers. Along with the Florida Meritorious Instructional Personnel Program, California's legislature has enacted a teacher merit pay statute that is also slated for implementation in 1983-84¹ (see Appendix C).

Though education is essentially a state responsibility, hungry national politicians in search of campaign issues, have seized upon the teacher compensation recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education to give visibility to merit pay.² This enthusiasm, along with Secretary of Education, Terrel H. Bell's interest in the subject, has gained the attention of President Reagan, who, in several recent speeches has attempted to elevate merit pay to the level of a national political concern.³ In a 1983 issue of the *American School Board Journal*, Cramer states,

The Reagan Administration, whose main education concerns previously had been limited to support of tuition tax credits for private schools, abolishment of the Department of Education, and dedication to the reinstatement of school prayer, suddenly discovered it had

a political issue: Like a batter lunging at a hanging curve ball, political strategists in the Administration leaped at an issue that pitted concerned parents against giant teacher unions. These strategists placed the President on the side of popular public opinion against the unions' vested interests.⁴

In 1983, the United States Congress responded to the extent of public and political interest in merit pay by establishing a twenty-one member bipartisan panel to review the issue. Chaired by Representative Paul Simon, Democrat of Illinois and Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, this Congressional task force took seriously the recommendations of recent school reform studies, and concluded that all states should experiment with various ways of linking teachers' pay to their performance.¹

Theory

Aside from actual practice, there is nothing particularly complicated about merit pay; the concept rests upon a line of logic that states that an individual should be compensated in relation to job performance. Support for the merit, or pay for performance, idea is found in basic expectancy theory, which assumes that performance is measureable for the purpose of differentiating salaries, and that financial rewards do stimulate employee performance. In an examination of this relationship, Milbourn has indicated that "pay can be an important source of motivation when the amount of pay an employee receives is tied to his or her job performance."¹

Not all behavior theorists, however, necessarily accept the pay for performance premise. Its logic is, perhaps, deceptive, argues Meyer, who states that not only are merit pay plans an inadequate means of motivating employees, but that they may actually reduce motivation. This consequence apparently results from the above average perceptions that the majority of employees have about their own job performance. The failure, therefore, to be selected for merit pay results in a clear threat to employee self-esteem; a condition which, in turn, leads to demeaning the importance of the job itself. This chain reaction then culminates in reduced job effectiveness.²

(FOOTNOTES)

¹Ibid., p. 46.

²Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay Plans for Teachers: Status and Descriptions* (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1983), p.v.

³George H. Gallup, "The Fifteenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (September 1983):45-46.

¹Editors, *Education USA*, January 9, 1984, p. 138.

²Marilee C. Rist, "Our Nationwide Poll: Most Teachers Endorse the Merit Pay Concept," *The American School Board Journal* 170 (September 1983):23.

³Thomas Toch, "Superintendents Favor Merit Pay, But Few Have Tried It, Poll Finds," *Education Week*, October 12, 1983, p. 5.

¹Susan Walton, "States' Reform Efforts Increase as Focus of Issue Shifts," *Education Week*, December 7, 1983, p. 5.

²Jerome Cramer, "Yes-Merit Pay Can Be a Horror, But a Few School Systems Have Done It Right," *The American School Board Journal* 170 (September 1983):28.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

¹Thomas Toch, "Merit Pay Panel to Urge Trials at State Level," *Education Week*, September 14, 1983, pp. 1, 20.

The overall motivational power of extrinsic rewards has been questioned by other researchers. Deci, for example, contends that people do not work just for money. Instead, greater satisfaction and self-enhancement are derived from the intrinsic rewards that develop around job tasks. Such conditions contribute to improved performance; and without these internal rewards, the individual's interest is likely to focus solely on financial compensation, rather than on the performance of the task itself.¹ Lortie relates the power of intrinsic rewards specifically to teachers, and concludes that the

psychic rewards derived from classroom experiences often determine the fundamental appeal of, and the level of satisfaction with the teaching profession.²

In a final attack on pay for performance theory, Meyer claims that such a system unnecessarily pits employees against one another in a competition over limited salary dollars. To distribute these rewards on the basis of relative performance forces employees into a series of "win-lose" competitive situations which, if left unattended, will undermine motivation and cooperation, and ultimately hinder the achievement of organizational goals.³

Assets and Liabilities

A reawakened concern for educational quality amidst a rapidly changing world can summon a return to beliefs deeply rooted in our past. The idea of paying on the basis of skills and performance does seem to embrace a fundamental American work ethic.¹ This nearly religious belief stirs the "spirit," and serves as the historical foundation of the merit pay concept.

Playing a large role in a collective results-oriented psyche, merit pay scratches the periodic itch caused by the blatant reminder that good teachers are paid the same as bad. Such a realization, combined with an enthusiasm for school reform, does, for the moment, return the arguments of merit pay proponents and opponents to the stage of national concern.

An analysis of related literature demonstrates that the arguments for and against the use of teacher merit pay are remarkably consistent from author to author. In a major compilation of merit pay research, the Educational Research Service, in *Merit Pay for Teachers*, draws upon studies from California and Minnesota to typify the advantages of merit systems:

1. Teachers should be paid what they are worth and at the same time known to be worth it.
2. The principal of merit schemes is not only sound but also logical; it should become the basis for teacher pay.
3. There should be added incentive for better work through merit salary increments; such increments produce better teaching.
4. Merit ratings will improve the quality of work done, which, in turn, will raise the general level of education in our schools.
5. The public is interested in receiving dividends for money

spent, so merit programs will make the public more willing to support higher salaries.

6. Merit programs will tend to draw and hold superior teachers in the profession, since they will have an opportunity to gain even better salaries if they are able.
7. Teachers are already rated daily by pupils, supervisors, parents, and fellow teachers, so there is no reason why there cannot be rating for pay.
8. Merit programs develop a demand for high quality work, which will produce higher quality of teaching.
9. A worker approaches his capacity as he is made to feel he is adequately rewarded; pay according to his worth will offer this reward.
10. Payment, among other things, should be made for quality, ability, service, efficiency, and effort.
11. There is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals, and the present basis of pay perpetuates this inequality.
12. Our present system gives security to teachers on the lower side of the efficiency scale, whereas we should give security to those at the other end of the scale.
13. The merit principle offers an opportunity for democratic working relationships.
14. Competent administration can make ratings with few inequalities; this should be a regular part of the administrator's assignment.
15. If rating is interpreted as evaluation, it should enhance the supervisory relationships.
16. Rating can be done even though it is subjective.
17. Industry has used this merit or bonus incentive with good results, so we should be able to adapt this business-like quality to our schools.¹

Holloway cites ten major advantages in adopting merit pay. These, too, reflect the consistency found in most arguments favoring its use:

1. Attracts and holds better teachers.
2. Is in harmony with the American tradition of paying on the basis of value received, regardless of the years of experience or training.
3. Stimulates and encourages individual improvement.
4. Encourages teachers to be critical of their work.
5. Improves morale.
6. Permits the teachers who wish to work from 8:00 to 4:00 to be paid a lesser amount and not feel inferior.

7. Keeps the better teachers in the classroom and does not make it necessary for them to seek administrative positions in order to obtain greater remuneration.
8. Necessitates more administrators, and this, in itself, is good; schools have always been understaffed administratively.
9. Enables the teachers to know where he or she stands in the eyes of administrators.
10. Will make the public more willing to support higher salaries.¹

Opponents of merit pay, on the other hand, view it as a compensation system fraught with problems and likely to fail. They point most often to the following factors in their argument to discourage merit pay use:

1. Over a period of time, all programs tried have proven unsuccessful.
2. Thus far, it has not been possible to measure teacher competence accurately; likewise, it is difficult to judge equal or significant merit.
3. Morale, working relationships, and other psychological problems are too complex for simple answers; merit programs develop attitudes that are competitive when they should be positive and cooperative.
4. Rating and gathering evidence for rating takes a lot more time than the benefits derived warrant; it takes time that administration and supervision staffs would use to help teachers.
5. Working conditions need improving before emphasis is placed on performance and will attract better teachers.
6. Young teachers are often denied competence ratings because of "full quotas" on merit levels, which discourage candidates from entering the field.
7. Merit regulations too frequently stereotype the teacher to standards and discourage creative teaching.
8. It is more important to recruit and train desirable people than to penalize those not so desirable.
9. Besides interfering with supervisory relationships, merit ratings increase teachers' work-loads, and they are heavy enough already.
10. It is more important that the general level of teaching be raised than that a few be rewarded; in-service education programs get far better results than merit or bonus programs.
11. Industry usually makes "merit" or "bonus" awards on the basis of quantity and not quality.
12. Industry, except in sales work, has largely given up bonus and merit incentives and is adopting in-service training and

- providing better working conditions to get better production.
13. Experience has shown that communities soon reject merit plans after they get them.
 14. Public interest is influenced more by lack of information on what the school is doing, or by population and socioeconomic conditions, than by genuine concern about improving teaching quality.
 15. Teachers, like other groups of people, represent a normal cross-section of ability.
 16. Merit programs too frequently pre-suppose that all improvement comes through changing the teachers.
 17. The development of professional standards, increasingly better opportunities for professional training, more intensive teacher recruiting, and more efficient use of competent research develop better teaching more rapidly and at less cost than any punishment or reward system.¹

(FOOTNOTES)

¹Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay Plans for Teachers: Status and Descriptions*, p. 1.

¹Merit Rating: Facts and Issues (Minnesota Education Association) and *Merit Salary Program for Teachers* (San Diego City Schools), quote in ERS, *Merit Pay for Teachers* (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979), pp. 4-5.

¹George E. Holloway, Jr., "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue," quoted in Oliver R. Gibson and Herold C. Hunt, *The School Personnel Administrator* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 297.

¹Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay for Teachers*, p. 5.

Wagoner characterizes the issue in simpler terms when he narrows, down to three, the basic arguments against the use of merit pay programs:

1. experience in and out of education shows that merit pay is unworkable
2. evaluation of teaching is too inaccurate to be used as a basis for merit pay
3. the system of discriminative rewards produces undesirable relations within schools.¹

Essential Elements

Experience gained through an analysis of the failures and successes of those teacher merit pay plans which have actually undergone the transition from theory to practice suggests that a number of critical elements to consider when planning such a complex compensation program. The chemistry of these elements, when combined, can enhance the probability of developing a successful merit pay program.

One of the few personally experienced in administering a teacher merit pay plan, Edmund Thorne, former Superintendent of Schools of West Hartford, Connecticut, identified a "user's" list of merit pay program key ingredients:

1. The prime principle underlying any merit pay plan should be the improvement of instruction - to help teachers succeed and improve in their work. The complete realization of this principle could, and probably should, eventually result in the advancement of the whole staff into the "superior service" category.
2. Merit awards should be based upon predetermined criteria and not upon percentage quotas. No qualified teacher should be denied an award because of some arbitrary limitation.
3. A merit plan is not likely to succeed unless a good professional salary schedule is already maintained. A merit pay plan should not be an excuse for keeping the salaries of most teachers down.
4. A merit salary program should not be adopted until after sufficient study, and then only upon thorough understanding and acceptance by a substantial majority of the staff. Teacher cooperation and involvement in a study must be secured.
5. A merit pay plan should be adapted to local conditions. There is no universal pattern that can be transferred wholesale from one district to another.
6. Any merit pay plan should have the complete understanding and support of the administrative personnel, the board, and the public.
7. All personnel in the school system including administrators and supervisors, should be rated.
8. There should be well-defined standards of evaluation agreed to and understood by those who are to be evaluated.
9. There should be ample opportunity for evaluation. From twelve to sixteen observations are needed for those teachers under the merit pay plan as compared to two to four observation visits for other non-merit pay candidates.

10. Only those teachers who request it should be evaluated for merit pay purposes and, conversely, teachers should be allowed to withdraw from the procedure if they so desire.
11. Merit awards should be commensurate with the value placed upon superior service. They should be large enough to offer real incentive.
12. Teachers must have confidence in the competence and integrity of the administrative staff or others responsible for evaluating them for merit pay.
13. Sufficient personnel should be provided to insure adequate time for evaluation.
14. Final selection of merit teachers should be entrusted to more than one individual. A rotating representative committee is recommended.
15. Individuals should be given the right to appeal.
16. Adequate budgetary safeguards should be established to provide continuity of the program from one year to the next.
17. Plans should be incorporated for the continuous re-evaluation of any merit pay plan in light of new experience.
18. Provision should be made for informing new and potential staff members regarding the philosophy of the program, its application, and the rights and obligations of all for whom the program is intended.¹

In a 1983 presentation to Virginia school superintendents, Glen Robinson recommended that the following criteria be used for developing teacher incentive pay plans:

1. *Effective evaluation procedures* - Effective evaluation procedures are essential and fundamental to the successful operation of any pay plan based on teacher performance.
2. *Administrative workable* - The plan must be administratively workable, with enough trained management and supervisory staff to administer the plan effectively.
3. *Board and management commitment* - Both the school board and school administrative staff must be firmly committed to the plan and willing to spend sufficient time and resources to make the plan work.
4. *Staff involvement in program development* - Although there may not be staff enthusiasm for the establishment of an incentive pay plan, there should be staff knowledge and involvement in developing the best possible plan.
5. *Promotes teacher satisfaction* - The plan should be designed so that teachers who are the recipients of the rewards will find them personally and professionally satisfying.

6. *Adequately financed* - It should be clearly understood by all concerned that incentive pay plans are not cost-saving and that successful plans will probably cost more money, not less.
7. *Available to all who qualify* - One of the surest ways to build failure into an incentive plan is to restrict arbitrarily the extra pay to a small portion of the staff, such as 10 percent. Increases should be available to all who meet the incentive criteria. On the other hand, the wholesale granting of incentive increases to those who do not clearly qualify will soon destroy the system.
8. *Plausible definition of superior performance* - It is essential that the performance be visibly fair and equitable, not only to teachers and administrators, but also to the school board and the public.
9. *Valid measures of results* - There should be valid and verifiable measures of the results of superior teaching that provide a sound basis for determining appropriate compensation.
10. *Assessment measures objectively and consistently applied* - Consistency and objectivity in the application of assessment measures are basic to the effective operation of an incentive pay system.
11. *Promotes increased learning* - The most fundamental criterion of any incentive pay plan for teachers is that it promotes increased learning for pupils.¹

¹Edmund H. Thorne, quoted in Anthony E. Conte and Eugene R. Mason, *Merit Pay: Problems and Alternatives* (New Jersey: State Department of Education, Division of Research, Planning and Education, April 1972), pp. 13-14.

Jacobson, Logsdon, and Wiegman have identified six principles which constitute the basis for dealing constructively with merit pay. First, any system planning to adopt the merit pay principle should already possess a good basic salary schedule. Second, criteria should be established outlining the items to be considered in the determination of merit, and teachers should have a share in determining the criteria. Third, there should be no limit to the number of teachers entitled to merit raises. Fourth, those who are made responsible for making the evaluations should be identified and made known to the staff. Fifth, the staff and community should be informed of the schedule and made aware of its provisions. Sixth, the method should be placed under continuous study and changes made when conditions warrant them.¹

¹Robinson, "Pacing Teachers for Performance and Productivity: learnig from Experience," pp. 5-6.

In a summary of salient points relating to merit compensation system, Castetter has written:

1. Systematization of the appraisal process does not make the process precise and objective, nor does it eliminate value judgements.
2. Experimentation with merit rating for more than a half-century in public education has produced no clear-cut evidence or consensus as to its ability to improve the performance of personnel.
3. Until recent years, *performance* in most positions in a school system had not been measured directly. Consequently, activities associated with personnel *effectiveness* had been identified and appraised. *Services rendered* were thus the primary focus, rather than *services received*.
4. The crux of the difficulty in linking compensation to individual performance is the method of appraisal.
5. Unions and personnel associations have been reluctant to accept the basic assumptions underlying merit rating.²

¹Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, *The Principalship: New Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, INC., 1973), pp. 383-84.

²William B. Castetter, *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), p. 330.

In a summary of her analysis of merit pay research, Weissman has concluded that where such plans appear to work, the following conditions generally exist:

1. districts are small to medium sized
2. these districts possess a relatively high assessed valuation per student
3. local patrons include a large number of professional and economically advantaged residents
4. extensive research was conducted prior to implementation, with teachers participating in each phase
5. rating forms are definite and agreed upon
6. merit supplements are sizable and come on top of a good salary schedule
7. an arbitration procedure is provided
8. programs are continually reviewed and modified where needed.¹

¹Weissman, "Merit Pay - What Merit?", pp. 18-19.

(FOOTNOTES)

¹Gene Milbourn, Jr., "The Relationship of Money and Motivation," *Compensation Review*, ANACOM, a division of American Management Associations 12 (Second Quarter):34.

²Herbert H. Meyer, "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma," *Organizational Dynamics*, ANACOM, a division of American Management Associations 3 (Winter 1975):44

¹Edward L. Deci, "The Hidden Costs of Rewards," *Organizational Dynamics*, AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations 4 (Winter 1976):61-72.

²Dan C. Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp. 84-85.

³Meyer, "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma," p. 42.

¹Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay Plans for Teachers: Status and Descriptions*, p. 1.

¹*Merit Rating: Facts and Issues* (Minnesota Education Association) and *Merit Salary Program for Teachers* (San Diego City Schools), quote in ERS, *Merit Pay for Teachers*, (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979.), pp. 4-5.

¹George E. Holloway, Jr., "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue," quoted in Oliver R. Gibson and Herold C. Hunt, *The School Personnel Administrator* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 297.

¹Educational Research Service, *Merit Pay for Teachers*, p. 5.

¹Wagoner, "The Case for Competition," pp. 111-13.

¹Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, *The Principalship: New Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 383-84.

²William B. Castetter, *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), p. 330.

¹Weissman, "Merit Pay - What Merit?", pp. 18-19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anderson, John F., and Berdie, Douglas, R. *Questionnaires: Design and Use*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.
- Boyer, Ernest L. *High School, A Report on Secondary Education in America*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1983.
- Broudy, Harry S. *The Real World of the Public Schools*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.
- Castetter, William B. *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
- Chandler, Charles C., and Gross, Carl H. *The History of American Education Through Readings*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964.
- Dejnozka, Edward L., and Kapel, David E. *American Educators' Encyclopedia*. Greenwood Press, 1982.
- Dilman, Don A. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1978.
- Fink, Arlene, and Kosecoff, Jacquelin. *How To: Evaluate Educational Programs*. Capitol Publications, Inc., 1980.
- French, William M. *America's Educational Tradition*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1964.
- Gibson, Oliver R., and Hunt, Herold C. *The School Personnel Administrator*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Good, Carter V., ed. *Dictionary of Education*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959.
- Goodlad, John F. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1983.
- Henerson, Marlene E.; Morris, Lynn Lyons; and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor. *How to Measure Attitudes*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications, 1978.
- Holloway Jr., George E. "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue." Quoted in Oliver R. Gibson and Herold C. Hunt, *The School Personnel Administrator*, p. 297. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Jacobsen, Paul B.; Logsdon, James D.; and Wiegman, Robert R. *The Principalship: New Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Johns, Roe L., and Morphet, Edgar L. *The Economics and Financing of Education: A Systems Approach*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Jones, Ralph H. *Methods and Techniques of Educational Research*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1973.

Lorrti, Dan C. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Dissertations

Brooks, Jordan Allen, Jr. "An Analysis of Selected Texas Public Secondary School Professional Staff Attitudes Toward Merit Pay." Ph.D. dissertation, Texas A&M University, August 1979.

Love, Harris Edward. "An Identification and Evaluation of Merit Pay Factors." Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1970.

Oates, Arnold Dale, Jr. "A Study of Supplemental Salary Aid Programs and Merit Pay Practices in Selected Texas and School Districts." Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1966.

Rometo, Arthur Frank. "Attitudes of Teachers, Administrators, and School Directors of Pennsylvania Toward Merit Rating." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1961.

Swain, Lorna Mullen. "Merit Rating Plans for Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1960.

Periodicals, Journals and Other Sources

Barber, Larry W., and Klein, Karen. "Merit Pay and Teacher Evaluation." 65 *Phe Delta Kappan* (December 1983): 247-51.

Best, Leonard E. "Incentive Pay for Better Teaching." *School Executive* 69 (May 1950): 43-45

Bhaerman, Robert D. "Merit Pay? No!" *National Elementary Principal* 52 (February 1973): 63-71.

Breckenridge, Patti. "Florida Council Approves Three Merit-Pay Procedures for Teachers." *Education Week*, December 7, 1983, p. 19.

Brownell, S.M. "A Workable Plan for Recognition of Merit." *Education Digest* 13 (March 1948): 32-33.

Bruno, James E., and Nottingham, Marvin A. "Linking Financial Incentives to Teacher Accountability in School Districts." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 10 (Autumn 1974): 46-62.

- Burke, Brian T. "Merit Pay for Teachers: Round Valley May Have the Answer." *Phi Delta Kappan* 64 (December 1982): 265-66.
- Chethik, Neil. "Evaluations, Attendant Crucial in Merit Plan." *Tallahassee Democrat*, 10 July 1982, sec. F., p.9.
- Cook, William A. "Merit Rating and Salary Increase." *American School Board Journal* 124 (June 1952): 33-34.
- Cramer, Jerome. "Yes - Merit Pay Can Be a Horror, But a Few School Systems have Done it Right." *The American School Board Journal* 170 (September 1983): 28.
- Deci, Edward L. "The Hidden Cost of Rewards." *Organization Dynamics* AMACOM, a Division of American Management Associations 4 (Winter 1976): 61-72.
- Duffy, Michael M. "Update on Merit Pay in Illinois." *Illinois Association of School Boards* (July 1983): 1-3.
- Education USA*. (October 12, 1983): 5.
- Education USA*. (October 13, 1983): 68.
- Education USA*. (January 9, 1984): 138-39.
- Educational Research Service. *Merit Pay for Teachers*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979.
- Educational Research Service. *Merit Pay Plans for Teachers: Status and Descriptions*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1983.
- English, Fenwick W. "Merit Pay: Reflections on Education's Lemon Tree." *Education Leadership* 41 (December 1983/January 1984): 72-79.
- Fickler, Ellen. "N.E.A. Obfuscates on Merit Pay." *The Executive Educator* 5 (October 1983): 26-28.
- Florida. Department of Education. *The Florida Education Directory 1983-84*. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education, 1983.
- Florida. "Graham Proposes Meritorious Teacher Program." *Press Release from the Office of the Governor*. Tallahassee, FL: Office of the Governor, May 13, 1984.
- Florida Teaching Profession - National Education Association. *Position Statement Addressing Merit pay for Florida Public School Teachers*. May 19, 1983.
- Fosdick, Harry A. "Merit Ratings - How and By Whom?" *Nation's Schools* 57 (January 1956): 58-62.

- Gallup, George H. "The Fifteenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (September 1983): 45-46.
- Glasman, Naftaly S. "Merit Pay: A Case Study in a California School District." *Instructional Science* 3 (1974): 89-110.
- Gragg, W.L. "The Ithaca Merit Salary Program." *The Journal of Teacher Education* 8 (June 1957): 159-64.
- Gudridge, Beatrice M. "How to Reward Teacher for Good Teaching." *AASA Critical Issues Report* (1980): 21-23.
- Hechinger, Fred M. "Teachers Should Be Open to Pay Reform." *Tampa Tribune*, 28 June 1983, sec. A., p. 9.
- Holloway, George E., Jr. "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue." *The School Executive* 78 (April 1959): 19-21.
- Kleinman, Jack H. "Merit Pay - The Big Question." *NEA Journal* 52 (May 1963): 42-44.
- Lawler, Edward E. "Merit Pay: Fact or Fiction?" *Management Review* 70 (April 1981): 50-53.
- McCormick, Kathleen. "A.F.T. Flirts with Merit Pay." *The Executive Educator* 5 (October 1983): 21-31.
- McGuire, Willard. "Merit Pay Schemes Have Never Worked." *USA Today*, 2 June 1983, sec. A, p. 8.
- McKenna, Charles D. "Merit Pay? Yes!" *National Elementary Principal* 52 (February 1973): 69-71.
- Megal, Carl J. "Merit Rating - The Ghost Walks Again." *The American Teacher* 36 (March 1952): 24.
- Meyer, Herbert H. "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma." *Organizational Dynamics*, AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations 3 (Winter 1975): 39-50.
- Milbourn, Gene, Jr. "The Relationship of Money and Motivation." *Compensation Review*, AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations 12 (Second Quarter 1980): 33-44.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (April 1983).
- National Education Association. *Superior Service Maximums in Teachers Salary Schedules, 1956-57*. Washington, D.C.: NEA Research Division, 1957.

- Neal, Richard G. "Performance Evaluation and Merit Pay." *Evaluation and Merit Pay Clinics*. New York State School Boards Associations, Inc., pp. 25-29.
- Pellicer, Leonard O. "A Merit Pay Plan Based on Productivity." *The Administrator* 5 (December 1981): 14-16.
- Pipho, Chris. "Stateline." *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (November 1983):165.
- Rist, Marilee C. "Our National Poll: Most Teachers Endorse the Merit Pay Concept." *The American School Board Journal* 170 (September 1983):24-27.
- Robinson, Glen E. "Paying Teachers for Performance and Productivity: Learning from Experience." *ERS Concerns in Education*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, May 1983.
- Rounds, Jay. "Performance-Based Compensation Can Work for You." *Calpelra Newsletter*. (October 1980):3.
- Say, Elaine, and Miller, Leslie. "Incentive Pay for Houston." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (December 1982):270-71.
- Schaefer, William. "Merit Compensation/Paying for Performance." *Arizona School Board Journal* 3 (April 1981):10-11;16-17.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Financial Incentives and Teacher Accountability: Are We Paying for the Wrong Thing?" *Educational Administration Quarterly* 11 (Spring 1975):112-15.
- Shanker, Albert. "Why 'Merit Pay' Plans Don't Work." *New York Times*, 14 March 1982, p. 11E.
- Shaw, Cathy. "How to Measure Results is Key to Teachers' Merit Pay." *Miami Herald*, 20 November 1983, p. 15D.
- Staff Report to the Governor's Educational Study Committee and Report to the Governor by the Governor's Education Study Committee*. Baton Rouge, LA: Governor's Education Study Committee, May 1975.
- Stokes, Douglas M. "A New Mathematical Approach to Merit-Based Compensation Systems." *Compensation Review*, AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations 13 (Fourth Quarter 1981):43-55.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, *Action for Excellence*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1983.

- Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools. *Meeting the Need for Quality: Action in the South*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1983.
- Templeton, Ian. *Merit Pay*. Eugene, Oregon: Educational Management Review Series, Number 10, November 1972.
- Thorne, Edmund H. Quoted in Anthony E. Corte and Eugene R. Mason, *Merit Pay: Problems and Alternatives*, pp. 13-14. New Jersey: State Department of Education, Division of Research, Planning and Education, April 1972.
- Toch, Thomas. "Merit-Pay Panel to Urge Trials at State Level." *Education Week*, September 14, 1983, pp. 1,20.
- "Superintendents Favor Merit Pay, But Few Have Tried It, Poll Finds." *Education Week*, October 12, 1983, p. 5.
- U.S. Congress House. Committee on Education and Labor. *Merit Pay Task Force Report*, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- Utah School Merit Study: *Report and Recommendations*. Salt Lake City: Utah School Merit Study Committee, November 1958.
- Wagoner, Roderic L. "The Case for Competition." *The Clearing-House* 44 (October 1969):111-13.
- Walton, Susan. "Florida Governor Seeks Swift Action on Rule to Implement Merit-Pay Plan." *Education Week*, January 19, 1984, pp. 1, 18.
- "Florida Teachers' Union to Offer Alternative Merit-Pay Plan to Council." *Education Week*, October 26, 1983, p. 8.
- "States' Reform Efforts Increase as Focus of Issue Shifts." *Education Week*, December 7, 1983, p. 5.
- Weissman, Rozanne. "Merit Pay - What Merit? *Education Digest* 34 (May 1969):16-19.
- West, Allan M. "The Case for and Against Merit Rating." *School Executive* 69 (June 1950):48-50.

PART III

SUMMARY

History clearly illustrates the ebb and flow of the merit pay debate. For over sixty years, the merit rating "pendulum" has swung in concert with the level of public discontent over educational quality. While interest in merit pay for teachers is currently widespread, and a measure of public support exists for its implementation, merit pay has yet to become a widely accepted compensation practice in American public education.

Where merit pay has been tried, it has generally been discontinued. A combination of faulty design, administrative difficulties, and the lack of a lasting commitment to the program seem to underline many merit pay failures. Add to these obstacles the notion that teachers, those most directly affected by the adoption of merit pay programs, are seldom able to see a distinct relationship between their performance and the granting of merit bonus. Until this prerequisite problem of a lack of mutually agreed upon evaluation criterion is resolved, many merit pay plans will continue to be constructed upon a foundation of quicksand, where few programs can hope to stand.

Aided by the recent release of a number of widely publicized school reform studies, merit pay has, for the moment, found its way back into the national spotlight. As a recommendation common to nearly all current calls for educational reform, it reflects a reawakened concern over the need to pay teachers based upon their performance, and perhaps offers a partial solution to the problem of attracting, motivating, and retaining a highly qualified public school instructional staff. Such beliefs, combined with a sympathetic climate toward school reform, have prompted a number of state governors and legislatures to consider the proposal of some form of merit pay legislation in 1984.

It is within this context that the 1983 Florida Legislature enacted what has been proclaimed to be the nation's "first" statewide teacher merit pay program. As this state embarks upon performance-based compensation for teachers and as individual school districts begin to respond to legislative initiative, there emerges a need to develop a sound merit pay data base. Believing that no successful educational concern can plan intelligently for the future without adequate information, the descriptive survey becomes an important tool in the decision-making process. More specifically, to the extent that attitudes contribute to behavior, the survey represents a means by

which the views of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel can be determined.

This study, therefore, was conceived and conducted to survey, analyze, and compare the attitudes of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward teacher merit pay. More specifically, the purpose of this preliminary investigation was to examine whether the perceptions of school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators were non-supportive or supportive of merit pay, and whether any significant differences in merit pay views were evident among those surveyed.

Following a selected review of the literature, a survey instrument was designed to measure the attitudes of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel. Following extensive field-testing, the attitudes toward the study topic were sought through a survey instrument which consisted of twenty-six opinion statements and eight general background, or demographic, items.

Enclosed with an explanatory cover letter, the survey instrument was forwarded to 510 school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators throughout each of Florida's sixty-seven school districts. Each participant was asked to respond to all survey items, using a five-point, Likert-type scale which contained the following response choices: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) no opinion, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

A total of 376 questionnaires were returned within one month following the initial mailing, equaling a response rate of 74 percent. To determine the overall attitudes of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay, each opinion statement response was assigned a numeric weight which ranged from one to five points. Response point values were assigned in relation to the direction of opinion statement, with the non-supportive opinion statements receiving the higher point values. All point values were summed, and an overall attitude score was determined.

Overall non-supportive or supportive merit pay scores were analyzed according to the prime educational responsibility of the respondents, and by seven other background factors: (1) total years of educational policy making and/or administration, (2) sex, (3) race, (4) level of formal education, (5) direct involvement in performance-based pay, (6) stance on the adoption of merit pay, and (7) political views. In addition to using the overall respondent score data to describe the opinions of Florida public school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators toward merit pay, the response to each of the twenty-six opinion statements were totaled, and analyzed for significant differences.

The findings of the study which were drawn from the analyses of the 364 overall attitude scores and sets of individual opinion statement responses, indicate that the perceptions of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel may be described as follows:

1. More Florida public school policy makers and administrators perceive merit pay for instructional personnel in a non-supportive than in a supportive manner. These perceptions, however, are held by less than a majority of all those surveyed (45 percent)
2. Thirty-nine percent of all responding policy makers and administrators express supportive opinions toward merit pay for teachers
3. The most intense "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree" attitude responses to the questionnaire opinion statements are generally not selected by the survey respondents (75 percent of the responses are distributed in the middle three response choice categories)
4. The strongest expression of non-support for teacher merit pay is registered by Florida superintendents, of which a majority of its members (54 percent) raise at least some question about its value to education
5. Support for merit pay for instructional personnel is more likely to come from Florida personnel administrators and school board members, although a majority of the members of both subgroups fail to express such views (42 and 41 percent, respectively)

6. Those who express the most ambivalence toward teacher merit pay are Florida instructional administrators, where nearly one in four (23 percent) demonstrate neither non-support nor support for the study topic
7. Differences in the overall perceptions toward merit pay for instructional personnel are not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence between Florida school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators
8. There are no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between the overall attitudes of Florida school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators toward merit pay for teachers and (1) total years of educational policy making and/or administrative experience, (2) sex, (3) race, (4) level of formal education, (5) prior experience with performance-based pay, (6) stance on district adoption of merit pay, and (7) political views
9. The opinions of school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators and personnel administrators differ significantly at the .05 level of confidence on only one of twenty-six teacher merit pay opinion statements ("first raise all teacher salaries by at least one-third before considering merit pay").

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study have resulted from an analysis of the findings gathered through an extensive review of merit pay literature, and from the data gathered through this attitude survey. The results of the research in the study are consistent with many of the findings found in the survey of the literature, and clearly reflect the controversial and complex nature of the teacher merit pay topic. The lack of a uniform definition, combined with an uneven history, make the findings of most teacher merit pay attitudinal research appear to be the product of an "inexact science." While wide acceptance for the teacher merit pay concept seems to exist, these views are often contradicted by the realities of its implementation. The by-product of such confusion seems to be the development of conflicting attitudes which are, at times, composed of various mixtures of uncertainty and ambivalence toward paying teachers on the basis of a measurement of their performance.

As the scope of this study was limited to the issue of merit pay for instructional personnel in the State of Florida, the following conclusions apply only to the school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators of that state. From the results that were obtained through this study, it can be concluded that:

1. The perceptions of Florida public school policy makers and administrators toward merit pay for instructional personnel are, to a slight degree, non-supportive
2. The majority of the attitudes of Florida public school policy makers and administrators, whether nonsupportive or supportive, are not, generally, strongly held
3. Differences in merit pay opinion among the respondents are for the most part not significant relative to selected demographic factors

The general absence of strongly conclusive attitudes toward merit pay for instructional personnel by Florida public school board members, superintendents, instructional administrators, and personnel administrators may reflect a combination of the controversy typically associated with the merit pay debate, along with the status of teacher merit pay in Florida at the time the survey was conducted.

Responding to their knowledge of, and feelings for, (1) the current state of merit pay conditions in Florida, and, (2), their lack of direction participation in successful teacher merit pay program operation, state public school policy makers and administrators as a whole found themselves to be generally unfamiliar with and unsure of the proper role of merit pay in public education. As new perceptions of teacher merit pay emerge, however, and particularly as educational researchers combine with practitioners to specify and systematically evaluate effective teaching behaviors, more opportune conditions for effective performance-based pay implementation in Florida may arise.

Recommendations

Beyond the scope of this investigation, there are two suggestions for further research: (1) A longitudinal study should be initiated to examine the effects of teacher merit pay on a specific population over a sufficient period of time, and (2), Survey groups likely to hold distinct attitudes toward merit pay (i.e., teachers, legislators) should be included in the survey population.

RELATIONSHIP OF EXPECTANCY WORK MOTIVATION, SELECTED SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND LOCUS OF CONTROL TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by
David G. Binnie

Statement of the Problem. The problem investigated in this study included the following: (a) the determination of an explanation for the variability from school to school of teacher job satisfaction in terms of school size, teaching experience and motivation; (b) the determination of whether or not subgroups of schools determined by size and experience differ significantly with respect to job satisfaction and expectancy work motivation; (c) the determination of the correlation between schoolwide levels of job satisfaction and locus of control; and (d) the determination of the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism among highly motivated teachers.

Significance of the Problem. Job satisfaction has been a focal point of research since the early part of this century when Taylor (1911) drew attention to the need to understand the human element with respect to its place in improving the effectiveness of work organizations. For the most part, the impetus has been primarily to understand the elements or dynamics of job satisfaction and then, ultimately, to be able to affect these in order to, either directly or indirectly, improve the output of the organization. The job satisfaction-productivity correlation has been repeatedly found to be positive, but of small magnitude (Vroom, 1964; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Scrivastva et al., 1977). This research trend has been evident in educational organizations and has yielded similar findings. Educational productivity, whether in the form of school effectiveness (Miskel et al., 1983), teacher performance (Cooper, 1977a; Miskel et al., 1980), student achievement (Cooper, 1977a) or student attitudes (Miskel et al., 1983), has been found to be significantly related to job satisfaction with consistently low to moderate correlations. Tangible personnel concerns correlated with low job satisfaction, or job dissatisfaction, have been identified as absenteeism (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964), turnover (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955) and increased adversity between teachers and administrators (Cook, 1979). Less tangible, but perhaps equally important, has been the humanitarian value ascribed to job satisfaction by Smith et al., (1969), who concluded that this value was a legitimate goal apart from productivity concerns.

These rationales, in concert, provided ample justification to warrant further investigation of job satisfaction within educational institutions

where much national concern has been focused, recently, relative to the effectiveness of those institutions and their professionals.

Conceptual Framework. Expectancy theory, as applied to the work situation by Vroom (1964), served as the theoretical base for this study. Vroom (1964) termed this application expectancy work motivation and identified its three basic components: (a) valence; (b) instrumentality; and (c) expectancy. Vroom (1964) defined these concepts in the following manner:

- (1) Valence (V) refers to the perceived level of value an outcome has within a work setting.
- (2) Instrumentality (I) represents the subjective probability that an outcome with a particular valence will follow a certain level of performance.
- (3) Expectancy (E) refers to the subjective probability that an individual believes exists relative to his or her ability to achieve a particular performance level.

The fundamental assumption of this theory is that all decisions are related to the psychological events that occur with the behavior. Motivation, therefore, is a cognitive process whereby the individual decides how to behave based on a continual review and evaluation of subjective probabilities and importance levels. This process was formulated by Galbraith and Cummings (1967) as $FM = E(\sum IV)$. This postulates that the force of motivation (FM) is the product of expectancy (E) multiplied times the summation of the cross products of instrumentality (I) and valence (V).

Locus of control, a companion concept of expectancy theory, is also fundamental to this research. Briefly stated, locus of control represents an individual's perception of whether the obtaining of a desired outcome is attributed to an internal source or to an external source. Social learning theory (Rotter, 1966), from which this concept developed, and expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) are both similar in their cognitive orientation and in their eventual practical applications.

Expectancy theory, social learning theory and empirical findings related to teacher job satisfaction provided support for the hypotheses in this study. The independent variables addressed in these hypotheses were (a) expectancy work motivation, (b) school size, (c) faculty experience, (d) locus of control, and (e) teacher absenteeism. School size and faculty experience were the situational

variables in question. The dependent variable for this study was teacher job satisfaction.

Hypotheses. The following hypotheses provided direction to this study:

- I. Expectancy work motivation and selected situational variables are significantly related to teacher job satisfaction.
- IIa. Job satisfaction differs significantly between subgroups determined by school size (i.e., 0 to 399 pupils, 400 to 799 pupils, 800 pupils and over).
- IIb. Job satisfaction differs significantly between subgroups determined by amount of faculty experience (i.e., 0 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 years and over).
- IIIa. Expectancy work motivation differs significantly between subgroups determined by school size (i.e., 0 to 399 pupils, 400 to 799 pupils, 800 pupils and over).
- IIIb. Expectancy work motivation differs significantly between subgroups determined by amount of faculty experience (i.e., 0 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 years and over).
- IV. A significant positive correlation exists between job satisfaction and the rate of absenteeism for teachers who have high levels of expectancy work motivation.

Design. The research population for this study consisted of the 88 elementary school faculties in the Hillsborough County School System, Hillsborough County, Florida. Using a stratified random sampling procedure, 5, 25, and 10 schools were sampled from the small, medium and large school-size categories, respectively. Seven, 10, and 12 teachers were then randomly selected from schools in those strata, respectively.

A total of 405 surveys were mailed out. After two mailings, 277 (68.40%) were returned.

The survey instrument consisted of a three-part questionnaire. This included the School Structure and Climate Study (Miskel et al., 1983), which measured expectancy work motivation and job satisfaction, the

Hall-Smitley Personal Reaction Survey (Hall et al., 1980), which measured locus of control, and a section which gathered demographic and situational information. The data were analyzed using (a) frequency and central tendency procedures, (b) a multiple regression analysis procedure for Hypothesis I, (c) one-way analysis of variance procedures for Hypotheses IIa, IIb, IIIa and IIIb, and (d) Pearson r correlation procedures for Hypotheses IV and V.

Results for Hypothesis I. Hypothesis I was only partially supported. Of the three variables, school size, faculty experience and expectancy work motivation, only the model with expectancy work motivation alone was significant, explaining about 11% of the variance.

Results for Hypotheses IIa, IIb, IIIa and IIIb. None of these hypotheses were supported. No significant difference was found in any of the ANOVA procedures, thereby yielding insufficient conclusions relative to differences between subgroups of schools determined by school size and amount of faculty experience.

Results for Hypothesis IV. Hypothesis IV was not supported. Although the correlation coefficient ($r = .24$) between job satisfaction and locus of control reflected a tendency for teachers who are satisfied with their jobs to be internally controlled, the correlation was of too small a magnitude to be considered as being significantly different from zero.

Results for Hypothesis V. Hypothesis V was not supported. The correlation coefficient ($r = .42$) between job satisfaction and absenteeism for highly motivated teachers was not significantly different from zero. In spite of the lack of statistical significance, the correlation suggests that in this case, among those teachers with similar levels of valence, instrumentality and expectancy, those with higher job satisfaction tend also to be those who are more inclined to be absent from work.

Conclusions

Since the work of Taylor (1911), the impetus behind job satisfaction research has always been tied, whether directly or indirectly, to increasing productivity. Even though the linkage has been empirically demonstrated to be weak (Srivastva et al., 1977), it is the thread that runs through the literature in this area. This linkage, combined with humanitarian concerns (Smith et al., 1969), continues to generate research with job satisfaction as its focus. This research study is no exception. The purpose of this study was to build on existing literature dealing with job satisfaction. The intent was to be able to better explain job satisfaction and also to link it with a tangible organizational element, in this case absenteeism, so that the theoretical as well as practical results of the study would be significant. The results of the study, however, yielded a modest explanation of the variance of job satisfaction by expectancy work motivation and no statistically interpretable linkage of job satisfaction with the tangible outcome, absenteeism. The conclusion to which this leads is that the concept, job satisfaction, as herein defined and measured, is of somewhat limited practical and theoretical value. Gorton (1982) contended that the issues of productivity and teacher burnout compel further such study of teacher job satisfaction. This writer generally agrees, but recommends that research be aimed directly at understanding and reducing burnout and understanding and increasing teacher productivity rather than addressing these concerns through the indirect route of job satisfaction research. Increasing job satisfaction is a worthy goal that, perhaps, might best be approached indirectly, rather than directly.

The above thought notwithstanding, the results of this study do lead to certain conclusions relative to the job satisfaction of the population in question. The level of job satisfaction was in the neutral to satisfied range and the scores did not differ significantly between subgroups determined by either school size or amount of faculty teaching experience. In fact, both the means and the standard deviations of the subgroups were comparable. Since the unit of analysis was the school, it can be said that in Hillsborough County elementary schools, the collective perception of teachers from school to school is that they are fairly satisfied in their jobs. This is true in very large schools with student populations well over 800 as well as for those with populations of less than 400. It is also true for faculties at each extreme of the experience continuum. It can be concluded then, that this level of satisfaction is not primarily a function of local school conditions. District instituted organizational structure patterns and procedures may account for a degree of this consistency in satisfaction. This

writer contends, however, that it is also a function of commonly held values, beliefs and expectations. Lincoln et al (1981) maintained that organizational phenomena are shaped by cultural values, beliefs and expectations as well as by institutional organization patterns. It may be concluded, therefore, that these two sets of variables seem to play more of a major role in determining job satisfaction than do local conditions at individual schools.

Unlike the findings related to job satisfaction, it appears that local school conditions played a greater role in determining levels of expectancy work motivation. Although Expectancy work motivation levels did not differ significantly between subgroups determined by school size and faculty experience, there was a tendency for the standard deviations to fluctuate more, suggesting a greater variance in the schools' means. This supports the notion that local conditions may affect levels of valence, instrumentality and expectancy. The implication is that this may be due, to some degree, to the administrative style of the principal, the organization pattern of the school or some other element(s) which affects the levels of one or more of the three components of expectancy work motivation (valence, instrumentality and expectancy). This should encourage principals and other school leaders to be aware that they can help arrange for the existence of valent outcomes as well as related levels of instrumentality and expectancy. For example, a faculty may be highly motivated because, in part, the principal has helped convince it of the great intrinsic value of student achievement. If the faculty, in general, shares the view that (a) this is a valued outcome, (b) that a particular level of teaching performance will usually precede student achievement, and (c) that it is able to achieve that performance level, high expectancy work motivation will result. Each of these components can be influenced by local conditions. The value of the concept, expectancy work motivation, is confirmed by these results. This is further supported by the unhypothesized finding that expectancy work motivation accounts for 9% of the variance in absenteeism. Whether or not those in this research population, and their administrators, are fully aware of it, it appears by the relatively high district expectancy work motivation mean that these components are being effectively manipulated at the local level.

The findings related to expectancy work motivation also tend to confirm the validity of the Galbraith and Cummings (1967) formulation ($FM = [E\{IV}]$) and add to the theoretical and empirical base which supports expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964; Mitchell, 1974). This, in concert with its practical value to school

administrators, leads to the conclusion that research utilizing expectancy theory is a valuable dimension of current organizational research.

Along with expectancy work motivation, school size and amount of faculty experience were additional variables entered into the multiple regression analysis equation analyzing job satisfaction. Neither their addition to the model individually, nor in combination, made a statistically significant difference. Furthermore, when each of these two variables was examined with respect to significant differences across subgroups determined by school size and faculty experience, no significant difference was found in any of the four ANOVA procedures. Although insufficient evidence exists to warrant any conclusions relative to Hypotheses IIa, IIb, IIIa and IIIb, the findings do point to a need to better understand educational organizations with respect to these two variables. If, for example, school size makes no difference relative to expectancy work motivation and job satisfaction, and if it can be shown that teacher productivity and student achievement will not be adversely affected, perhaps schools should be constructed for larger populations because large schools are more cost effective. Furthermore, if experience is not a significant factor in these two areas, what implications exist for school administrators? There are no ready answers for these or other such questions of a similar nature. These two variables seem to elicit different results in education as opposed to business and industry. If the null hypotheses for Hypotheses IIa, IIb, IIIa and IIIb truly reflect reality, there are numerous implications in the areas of school plant planning, school administration, staff development and personnel administration. Popular assumptions contend that smaller faculties tend to be more highly motivated and satisfied. The same is often assumed to be true for faculties with less experienced teachers. Given the possible effects of these popular yet empirically unsupported assumptions, the earlier mentioned practical implications and the need for an empirical base, it is evident that a considerable research effort in this area is justifiable.

Contrary to the aforementioned area, there is a growing theoretical and empirical base concerned with the concept of locus and control within educational institutions and settings. The findings of this study indicate that elementary school teachers in Hillsborough County perceive themselves to be internally controlled rather than externally controlled. Given the size of the district (Hillsborough County is the fifteenth largest school district in the United States), this would indicate that these teachers feel a fair degree of freedom and

autonomy not always associated with large bureaucracies. Although this was not significantly linked to job satisfaction, it was correlated significantly ($r=.50$) with expectancy work motivation. This unhypothesized finding indicates that teachers who are highly motivated tend to perceive that they are principally in control of their professional lives rather than under the control of others or of chance. The correlation between locus of control and expectancy work motivation, the similarities of their theoretical frameworks and their common roots in cognitive psychology provide the impetus to consider locus of control in a work setting as a special case of expectancy work motivation. If this could be established, it is conceivable that locus of control could be examined via a formulation as in the case of the Galbraith and Cummings (1967) formulation of expectancy work motivation. This would greatly facilitate the measurement, analysis of data and understanding of the components of the concept. Furthermore, manipulation of the components, as in the case of valence, instrumentality and expectancy, might be possible and, ultimately, benefit all levels of an educational institution.

Another popular notion, and a hypothesis of this study not supported by the results of this research, is the view that absence is a pain-reductive response on the part of the worker. Hypothesis V reflected the inverse of this position. In the case of this study, not only was empirical support not evident, but the correlation ($r=.42$) between job satisfaction and absenteeism for highly motivated teachers suggested the possibility of an alternative view of absenteeism. Perhaps highly motivated teachers who are satisfied with their jobs find some satisfaction in taking sick days as "holidays," using the justification that this is deserved because of their hard work and relatively low pay. Certainly this is conjecture, but also a notion that cannot be easily dismissed given the lack of empirical evidence. Perhaps attendance at work is better viewed in light of motivation theory. Simple explanations, such as the "pain-reductive" hypothesis, have not been supported. Work attendance is a behavior, like many others, which can be analyzed within any one of a number of theoretical constructs—including expectancy theory. To do so may result in an empirically supportable approach to increase the teacher's motivation to refrain from being absent.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study suggest a possible need for further study in related areas. Recommendations include the following:

1. It is recommended that future research address the need to more precisely define job satisfaction within the framework of a theoretical construct.
2. It is recommended that job satisfaction not be a direct focus of future research but rather be approached indirectly. More specifically, further research directly concerned with teacher productivity and teacher burnout is warranted and job satisfaction research should be a subsidiary concern of those efforts.
3. It is recommended that educational organizations be examined with respect to the effects of organizational size and teacher experience. Furthermore, those findings should be compared with findings of similar research conducted in business and industrial settings.
4. It is recommended that the unhypothesized relationship between expectancy work motivation and teacher absenteeism ($r = -.30, p < .05$) be further analyzed. Analysis of the components of expectancy work motivation (valence, instrumentality and expectancy) should be correlated with absenteeism both separately, to see the individual relationship each has with absenteeism, as well as corporately, to examine the relationship of the total force of motivation with absenteeism.
5. It is recommended that locus of control be examined as a possible subconcept of expectancy work motivation, given the unhypothesized relationship between these variables found in this study ($r = -.50, p < .05$). Specifically, the purpose of such research would be to attempt to identify the components of and a formulation for locus of control similar to those which presently exist for expectancy work motivation.
6. It is recommended that the relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction for highly motivated teachers be further explored to investigate whether or not the findings of this study ($r = .42$) was spurious or, in fact, a true reflection of the absenteeism trend for this subgroup of teachers.

7. It is recommended that this study be replicated with possible variations to include (a) a midyear data collection, (b) fall and spring data collections, (c) the inclusion of secondary teachers to be compared with the elementary teachers (d) the identification and comparison of newly hired teachers and teachers near retirement, (e) the use of the individual teacher as the unit of analysis, and (f) an increased sample size.
8. It is recommended that research be conducted to identify outcomes and rewards which teachers tend to rate highly with respect to valence. The purpose would be to identify those highly ranked outcomes or rewards which would also tend to elicit high levels of instrumentality and expectancy, thereby, generating high levels of expectancy work motivation. This should be done for both elementary teachers, as a group, and secondary teachers, as a group.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aldag, R.J., & Brief, A.F. Some correlates of work values. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 757-760.
- Argyris, C. (1972). A few words in advance. In A.J. Marrow (Ed.), *The Failure of Success* (pp. 60-74). New York: American Management Association, Inc.
- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization*. New York: Harper.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavieh, A. (1972). *Introduction to educational research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Baba, V.V. (1979). *Job involvement: A critical review*. Working Paper Series, Concordia University, Montreal.
- Baba, V.V., & Jamal, M. (1976) On the nature of company satisfaction, company commitment and work involvement: An empirical examination of blue-collar workers. *Relations Industrielles*, 31, 434-447.
- Bachman, J.G., Smith, G.C., & Slesinger, J.A. (1966). Control, performance, and satisfaction: An analysis of structural and individual effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 127-136.
- Bentzen, M.M., Williams, R.C., & Heckman, P.A. (1979). A study of schooling: Adult experiences in schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61, 252-253.
- Bisconti, A.S., & Solmon, L.C. (1977). *Job satisfaction after college--The graduate's viewpoint*. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: The CPC Foundation.
- Blai, B.J., Jr. (1970). An occupational study of job satisfaction and need satisfaction. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 32, 383-388.
- Blauner, R. (1960). Work satisfaction and industrial trends in modern society. In W. Galenson & S. Lipset (Eds.), *Labor and trade unionism* (pp. 339-360). New York: Wiley.
- Brayfield, A.H., & Crockett, W.H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 416.
- Bridges, E.M. (1980). Job satisfaction and teacher absenteeism. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(2), 41-56.

- Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C.M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective.*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cheloha, R.S., & Farr, J.L. (1980). Absenteeism, job involvement, and job satisfaction in an organizational setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(4), 467-473.
- Chinoy, E. (1955). *Automobile workers and the American dreams.* New York: Doubleday & Co.
- Coch, L., & French, J.R.P., Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 1, 512-532.
- Cook, D.H. (1979). Teaching morale: Symptoms, diagnosis, and prescription. *Clearing House*, 52, 355-358.
- Cooper, J.F. (1977a). *The morale and teaching effectiveness of junior college teachers.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 266)
- Cooper, J.F. (1977b). *The relationship of morale and productivity: An historical overview.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 147 985)
- Cooper, M.R., Morgan, B.S., Foley, P.M., & L.B. (1979). Changing employee values: A deepening discontent. *Harvard Business Review*, January - February, 57, 117-125.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1959). *Essentials of psychological testing.* New York: Harper & Row.
- Crowne, D.P. (1964). *The approval motive.* New York: Wiley.
- Davis, J.W. (1966). Work involvement of executives. *Personnel Administration*, 29, 6-12.
- Davis, K. (1972). *Human behavior at work* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Davis, K. (1977). *Human behavior at work* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dunnette, M.D. (1976). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

- Filley, A.C., & House, R.J. (1969). *Managerial process and organizational behavior*. Glenview: Scott Foresman.
- Fischer, P.H. (1953). An analysis of the primary work group. *Sociometry*, 16, 272-276.
- French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Friedman, E.A., & Havighurst, R.J. (1959). *The meaning of work and retirement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friesen, D., Holdaway, E.A., & Rice, A.W. (1983). Satisfaction of school principals with their work. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19, 35-58.
- Galbraith, J., & Cummings, L. (1967). An empirical investigation of the motivational determinants of task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 2, 237-257.
- Gavin, J.F. (1970). *Ability, effort, and role perception as antecedents of job performance*. (Experimental publication system, manuscript number 190A) Washington, D.C.: APA.
- Gechman, A.S., & Weiner, Y. (1975). Job involvement and satisfaction related to mental health and personal time devoted to work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 521-523.
- Georgopoulos, A.H., Mahoney, G.M., & Jones, N.W. (1957). A path goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41, 345-353.
- Gibson, J.L., & Klein, S.M. (1970). Employee attitudes as a function of age and length of service: A reconceptualization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 13, 411-425.
- Goodman, P.S., Rose, J.H., & Furcon, J.E. (1970). Comparison of motivational antecedents of the work performance of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 491-495.
- Gorton, R.A. (1976). *School administration: Challenge and opportunity for leadership*. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown.

- Gorton, R.A. (1982). Teacher job satisfaction. In H.E. Mitzel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (pp. 1903-1908). New York: MacMillan.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: Wiley.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hackman, J.R., & Porter, L.W. (1968). Expectancy theory predictions of work effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 417-426.
- Hackman, J.R., & Suttle, J.A. (1977). *Improving Life at work: Behavioral Science to organizational change*. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- Haire, M. (1959). Psychological problems relevant to business and industry. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 169-194.
- Haire, M. (1956). *Psychology in management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hall, D.T., & Mansfield, R. (1975). Relations of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 201-210.
- Hall, B.W., Smitley, W.S., Villeme, M.G., & Schwartz, J. (1980). Development and validation of a teacher locus of control scale. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Boston.
- Hall, B.W., Topping, M., O'Phelan, M., & Wilson, N. (1983). Assessing teacher behavior change via systematic classroom observation and attitude profiling: A multi-year experience. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Harris, K.R., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (1984, April). Teacher characteristics as related to five dimensions of teacher stress, sex and age. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

- Hartley, M.P. (1978). Locus of control and need achievement as predictors of job satisfaction. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 14, 68-79.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum J.W. (1979). *Management: A contingency approach*. New York: Addison-Welsey.
- Heneman, H.G., III, & Schwab, D.P. (1972). Evaluation of research on expectancy theory and predictions of employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 78, 1-9.
- Herzberg, G., Mauser, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinions*. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Sunderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hopkins, A.H. (1983). *Work and job satisfaction in the public sector*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowan & Allanheld.
- Hoppock, J.R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper.
- Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1978). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hulin, C.L., & Smith, P.C. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 209-216.
- Hunt, J.G., & Hill, J.W. (1969). The new look in motivation theory for organizational research. *Human Organization*, 28, 476-490.
- Hunt, J.W., & Saul, P.N. (1975). The relationship of age, tenure and job satisfaction in males and females. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 609-702.
- Idik, B.P. (1965). Organization size and member participation: Some empirical tests at alternative explanations. *Human Relations*, 18, 339-350.
- Ivancevish, J.M., & McMahon, J.T. (1977). A study of task goal attributes, higher order need strength and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20, 552-563.

- Jones, A.P., James, L.R., & Bruni, J.R. (1979). Perceived leadership behavior and employment confidence in the leader as moderated by job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 146-149.
- Kanter, R.M. (1979). Changing the shape of work: Reform in academe. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 3-9.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger.
- Kanungo, R.N., Misra, S.B., & Dayal, I. (1975). Relationship of job involvement to perceived importance and satisfaction of employee needs. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 24, 39-59.
- Kilpatrick, F., Cummings, M., & Jennings, M. (1964). *The image of the federal service*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Kimbroug, R.B., & Nunnery, M.Y. (1976). *Educational administration: An introduction*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- King, N. (1970). Clarification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. *Psychological Bulletin*, 74, 18-31.
- Koura, H.S. (1963). *An experimental study of students' achievement in relationship to the morale of selected secondary school teachers*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Kovach, K.A. (1977). *Organization size, job satisfaction, absenteeism and turnover*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Lawler, E.E. (1970). Job attitudes and employee motivation: Theory, research, and practice. *Personnel Psychology*, 23, 223-237.
- Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Lawler, E.E., & Porter, L.W. (1967). Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial job performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 2, 122-142.
- Leavitt, H.J. (1958). *Managerial psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lefcourt, H.M. (1976). *Locus of control*. New York: Wiley.

- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lincoln, J.R., Hanada, M., & Olson, J. (1981). Cultural orientations and individual reactions to organizations: A study of employees of Japanese-owned firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 93-115.
- Luthans, F., & Kreitner, R. (1975). *Organizational behavior modifications*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman.
- Maslach, C. (1978). Job burnout: How people cope. *Public Welfare*, 36, 56-58.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Maslow, A.H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. (2nd ed.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- McLaughlin, M.W., & March, D.D. (1978). Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record*, 80(1), 69-94.
- Meyer, M.M., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Miskel, C.G. (1982). Motivation in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 65-88.
- Miskel, C.G., Bloom, S., & McDonald, D. (1982). Structural coupling, climate, and learning strategies intervention effectiveness. *Research Report No. 57* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.)
- Miskel, C.G., DeFrain, J.A., & Wilcox, K. (1980). A test of expectancy work motivation in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 70-92.

- Miskel, C.G., Fevurly, R., & Stewart, J. (1979). Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15, 97-118.
- Miskel, C.G., McDonald, D., & Bloom, S. (1983). Structural and expectancy linkages within schools and organizational effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19, 49-82.
- Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Expectancy models of job satisfaction, occupational preference, and effort: A theoretical, methodological, and empirical appraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81, 1053-1077.
- Mitchell, T.R. (1980). Expectancy-value models in organizational psychology. (Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington).
- Mitchell, V.F., Baba, V.V., & Epps, T. (1975). On the relationship between job involvement and central life interest. *Relations Industrielles*, 30, 166, 180.
- Mott, P.E. (1977). *The characteristics of effective organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mowday, R.T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 137-156.
- Muchinsky, P. (1977). Employee absenteeism: A review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 10, 316-340.
- Mumford, E. (1972). *Job satisfaction*. London: Longman.
- N.E.A. (1980). Teacher opinion poll: Job satisfaction. *Today's Education*, 69, 8.
- New York State United Teachers Organization. (1980). Teacher opinion poll: Attacks on teachers. *Today's Education*, 69, 21.
- Newman, J.E. (1975). Understanding organizational structure-job attitude relationship through perceptions of work environment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 371-379.
- Nicholson, N., Brown, C.A., & Chadwick-Jones, J.K. (1976). Absence from work and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(6), 728-737.

- Nowicki, S., & Duke, M.P. (1974). A locus of control scale for noncollege as well as college adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 36, 136-137.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction* (2nd ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Peters, L.H. (1977). Cognitive models of motivation, expectancy theory, and effort: An analysis and empirical test. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20, 129-148.
- Phares, E.J. (1976). *Locus of control in personality*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- Porter, L.W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfaction in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, 1-10.
- Porter, L.W. (1962). Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375-384.
- Porter, L.W. (1963a). Job attitudes in management: II. Perceived importance of needs as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 141-148.
- Porter, L.W. (1963b). Job attitudes in management: III. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of line versus staff type of job. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 267-275.
- Porter, L.W. (1963c). Job attitudes in management: IV. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of size of company. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 386-397.
- Porter, L.W., & Henry, M.M. (1964a). Job attitudes in management: V. Perceptions of the importance of certain personality traits as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 31-36.
- Porter, L.W., & Henry, M.M. (1964b). Job attitudes in management: VI. Perceptions of the importance of certain personality traits as a function of line versus staff type of job. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 305-309.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial attitudes performance*. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 7, 20-28.
- Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 151-176.
- Reid, D., & Zeigler, M. (1977). The contribution of personal control to psychological adjustment of the elderly. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver.
- Robinowitz, S.D., Hall, D.T., & Goodale, J.G. (1977). Job scope and individual differences as predictors of job involvement: Independent or interactive? *Academy of Management Journal*, 20, 273-281.
- Robinson, H.A., Connors, R.P., & Whitacre, G.H. (1966). job satisfaction researchers of 1964-65. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 42, 371-379.
- Robinson, J.P., Athanasion, R., & Head, K.B. (Eds.). (1978). *Measures of occupational characteristics*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Rose, J.S., & Medway, F.J. (1981a). Measurement of teachers' beliefs in their control over student outcome. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74(3), 185-190.
- Rose, J.S., & Medway, F.J. (1981b). Teacher locus of control, teachers' behavior, and student behavior as determinants of student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74(6), 375-381.
- Rotter, J.B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Rotter, J.B. (1955). The role of the psychological situation in determining the direction of human behavior. In M.R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 245-269). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rotter, J.B. (1960). Some implications of a social learning theory for the prediction of goal-directed behavior from testing procedures. *Psychological Review*, 67, 301-316.

- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80 (1, Whole Number 609).
- Saal, F.E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 53-61.
- Schaffer, R.H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. *Psychological Monographs*, 67 (Whole Number 364).
- Schneider, B., Hall, D.T., & Nygren, H.T. (1971). Self image and job characteristics as correlates of changing organizational identification. *Human Relations*, 24, 397-416.
- Schwab, D.P., Olian-Gottlieb, J.D., & Heneman, H.G., III. (1979). Between-subjects expectancy theory research: A statistical review of studies predicting effort and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 139-147.
- Schwychart, N. R., & Smith, D.C. (1972). Factors in the job involvement of middle managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 227-223.
- Sergiovanni, T.J., & Staratt, R.J. (1973). *Emerging patterns of supervision*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sherman, T.M., & Giles, M.B. (1981). The development and structure of personal control in teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74(3), 139-142.
- Smith, H.C. (1975). *Psychology of industrial behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, P.C. Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Srivastva, S., Salipante, P.F., Cummings, T.G., Notz, W.E., Bigelow, J.D., & Waters, J.A. (1977). *Job Satisfaction and productivity*. Kent, Ohio: Comparative Administrative Research Institute, Kent State University.
- Stapleton, J.C., Craft, J.C., & Frankiewicz, R.G. (1979). The relationship between teacher brinkmanship and teacher job satisfaction. *Planning and Changing*, 10, 157-168.
- Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Thomas, E.J., & Fink, C.F. (1963). Effects of group size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 60, 371-384.
- Tolman, E.C. (1959). Principles of purpose behavior. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science* (Vol. II) (pp. 92-157). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Tolman, E.C. (1932). *Purpose behavior in animals and man*. New York: Century.
- Trusty, F.M., & Sergiovanni, T.J. (1966). Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators: a proposal for restructuring teacher roles. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2, 168-180.
- United States Department of Labor. (1973). *Job satisfaction: Is there a trend?* (Manpower Research Monograph No. 30). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Viteles, M.S. (1953). *Motivation and morale in industry*. New York: Norton.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wahba, M.A., & Bridwell, L.G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 212-240.
- Walker, C.R., & Guest, R.H. (1952). *The man on the assembly line*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wallston, K.A., Maides, S., & Wallston, B. (1976). Health-related information seeking as a function of health-related locus of control and health value. *Journal of Research on Personality*, 10, 215-222.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*: New York: The Free Press.
- Weick, K.E. (1979). Cognitive process in organizations. In B.M. Straw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior: Vol. 1* (pp. 41-74). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Wernimont, P.F., Toren, P., & Kappel, H. (1970). Comparison of sources of personal satisfaction and of work motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 91-95.

- Wolf, M.G. (1970). Need gratification theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 87-94.
- Worthy, J. (1950). Organizational structure and employee morale. *American Sociological Review*, 15(2), 169-179.
- Zytowski, D.G. (1968). *Vocational behavior: Readings in theory and research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.